

REMARKS

Claims 18-27 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 18 has been amended. Claim 18 is independent. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Telephone Interview

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Examiner Yu in the September 28 and 29 telephone interviews. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

II. Amendment

Support for the amendment to claim 18 can be found in the specification at, for example, page 7, lines 7-14 and page 8, lines 8-23. Thus, no new matter is added.

III. Claim Interpretation

As discussed during the interview and in response to Examiner's the inquiry regarding the interpretation of "different," Applicants interpret "different" as not the same. In the examples in the Office Action, the sequence for unique code 1 (ABC) and the sequence for unique code 2 (ABZ) are different, and the sequence for unique code 1 (ABC) and the sequence for unique code 2 (XYZ) are also different.

IV. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 18-22 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 3,737,858 to Turner et al. (Turner) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,175,889 to Olarig, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,909,710 to Goldrian et al. (Goldrian) and U.S. Patent No. 6,061,344 to Wood; and rejects claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Turner, Olarig, Goldrian and Wood in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0063661 to Comiskey et al. (Comiskey). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 18 recites, *inter alia*, "for each system, the number of bits representing the unique identification code is greater than the number of bits representing the reduced addressing code." The applied references fail to teach or render obvious the recited features of independent claim 18.

The Office Action relies on Wood for disclosing the unique identification codes. Wood discloses a wireless identification device 12 that includes at least one antenna 14 connected to the circuitry 16 for wireless or radio frequency transmission and reception by the circuitry 16. The device 12 transmits and receives radio frequency communications to and from an interrogator 26. See col. 3, line 63 to col. 4, line 16. Generally, the interrogator 26 sends a command causing each device 12 of a potentially large number of responding devices 12 to select a random number from a known range and use it as that device's arbitration number. Three variables are used: an arbitration value, an arbitration mask and a random value ID. See col. 6, lines 4-35. The random value ID, arbitration value and arbitration mask each are set to a 4 bit value. See col. 6, lines 44-62. In other words, the variables are represented by the same number of bits.

Another arbitration method that can be employed is the Aloha method. In the Aloha method, the interrogator asks all devices 12 in the field to transmit their identification number in the next time slot. If the response is garbled, the interrogator informs the devices 12 that a collision has occurred, and the slotted Aloha scheme is activated. Each device 12 in the field responds within an arbitrary slot determined by a randomly selected value. In other words, in each successive time slot, devices 12 decide to transmit their identification number with a certain probability. See col. 11, lines 5-20. However, the arbitrary slot is not represented by less bits than the identification number.

Both methods for assigning identification numbers do not disclose that the number of bits representing the identification number is greater than the number of bits representing the

reduced addressing code. Thus, Wood fails to teach or render obvious for each microsystem, the number of bits representing the unique identification code is greater than the number of bits representing the reduced addressing code. Turner, Olarig, Goldrian and Comiskey fail to cure the deficiencies of Wood. Thus, the applied references, alone or in any combination, fail to teach or render obvious the recited features of independent claim 18.

The dependent claims are patentable at least due to their dependence on allowable independent claim 18 and for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 18-27 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge
Registration No. 30,024

Obert H. Chu
Registration No. 52,744

WPB:OHC/rlt

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: October 14, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--